

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY AND THE TRADITIONALLY WHITE
INSTITUTIONS (TWIs) IN SOUTH CAROLINA:
A UNITARY OR A DUAL SYSTEM?

Dr. Clifton F. Conrad

June 14, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PART ONE: INTRODUCTION	
Two Comparison Groups	4
Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP)	5
Key Terms in the Study	6
Purpose of the Study	8
PART TWO: FINDINGS	
Unnecessary Program Duplication	9
Meaningful (High-Demand and Non-Core) Program Uniqueness	18
PART THREE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION	
Summary of Findings: A Unitary (Desegregated) or a Dual (Segregated) System	26
Conclusion	28
PART FOUR: APPENDICES	
Appendix A: The Significance of Meaningful Program Uniqueness	29
Appendix B: Core Programs	34
Appendix C: High-Demand (Non-Core) Programs	36
References	39

PART ONE: INTRODUCTION

According to the U.S. Supreme Court in U.S. v. Fordice, 112 S. Ct. 2727 (1992), where a state has operated a de jure segregated system of higher education the state must take measures to eliminate those policies and practices (vestiges) traceable to the prior segregated system which have continuing segregative effects (Id at 2735). The Court held:

If the State perpetuates policies and practices traceable to its prior system that continue to have segregative effects—whether by influencing student enrollment decisions or by fostering segregation in other facets of the university system—and such policies are without sound educational justification and can be practicably eliminated, the State has not satisfied its burden of proving that it has dismantled its prior system. Such policies run afoul of the Equal Protection Clause, even though the State has abolished the legal requirement that whites and blacks be educated separately and has established racially neutral policies not animated by a discriminatory purpose (Id at 2737).

In compliance with the Fordice decision, a substantial amount of unnecessary duplication of programs at Traditionally Black Institutions (TBIs) by Traditionally White Institutions (TWIs)—unnecessary program duplication that is accompanied by the absence of a meaningful number of unique program offerings at the TBIs—is part and parcel of a de jure segregated system of higher education.

This study of academic programs in South Carolina’s public universities explores whether there is a unitary (desegregated) or a dual (separate) system between the 10 public four year-Traditionally White Institutions (TWIs) and the single Traditionally Black Institution (TBI): South Carolina State University. Two keystone criteria provide the foundation for addressing this question: 1) unnecessary program duplication of programs at South Carolina State University, and 2) meaningful program uniqueness at South Carolina State University.

Two Comparison Groups

To explore the question of whether there is a unitary or dual system of higher education in South Carolina, two sets of comparisons between the TWIs and South Carolina State University are used in this report. First, statewide comparisons are made between the 11 four-year public TWIs and South Carolina State University, including the institutions designated Research Institutions and those designated Comprehensive Teaching Institutions. Second, regional comparisons are made between two TWIs (U.S.C.-Columbia and U.S.C.-Aiken) and South Carolina State—all located in the Orangeburg/Columbia/Aiken region of South Carolina. Why these two sets of comparisons? With respect to the statewide comparison, to a considerable extent the TWIs in South Carolina as well as land-grant South Carolina State have statewide orientations with overlapping service areas. And in light of the Internet Age we live in, colleges and universities in South Carolina are expanding online education and, in turn, the service areas of the TWIs and South Carolina State University are overlapping even more. Moreover, because of the legacy of a de jure segregated system of higher education in South Carolina that was codified by the state legislature, a statewide comparison is needed to determine whether there continues to be a statewide dual structure. With regard to the regional comparison, this is made on the grounds that the service areas of the institutions included in this group—institutions with regional as well as statewide orientations—overlap to a large extent in light of their geographical proximity to one another.

Identified below are the TWIs and the TBI used in the statewide comparisons in this report¹:

Traditionally White Institutions (TWIs)

University of South Carolina-Columbia (U.S.C.-Columbia)
Clemson University
University of South Carolina-Aiken (U.S.C.-Aiken)
College of Charleston

Traditionally Black Institutions (TBI)

South Carolina State University (SCSU)

¹The Medical University of South Carolina was not included in the study in light of its distinctive mission.

Traditionally White Institutions (TWIs)

Coastal Carolina University
 University of South Carolina-Upstate (U.S.C.-Upstate)
 Francis Marion University
 Lander University
 The Citadel
 University of South Carolina-Beaufort (U.S.C.-Beaufort)
 Winthrop University

Identified below are the two TWIs and the TBI South Carolina State University that are located in the Orangeburg/Columbia/Aiken region:

Traditionally White Institutions

University of Columbia-Columbia (USC-Columbia)
 University of South Carolina-Aiken (USC-Aiken)

Traditionally Black Institution

South Carolina State University (SCSU)

Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP)

For the purpose of this study, an inventory was required to identify academic programs at the TWIs and at South Carolina State University. To that end, I used the academic program inventory based on the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) in Higher Education that is used by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education and the public universities in South Carolina. This inventory was developed on the basis of CIP information provided by the National Center for Education Statistics (IPEDS Completion Survey, U.S. Department of Education).² In brief, CIP is the national classification standard used by colleges and universities across the United States in collecting, reporting, and interpreting data on educational programs.³ CIP is also widely used by federal and state agencies along with statewide governing and coordinating boards as a classification scheme for identifying educational

²This inventory was directly taken from the document from the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education website entitled "Total Degrees Awarded by CIP Code, Institution, and Degree Level: SC Public & Independent Colleges and Universities, Fiscal Year- 2013-2014, Institution Type Public."

³Consonant with the CIP program classification scheme, the following definitions are used throughout the report. The first two digits of a CIP code refer to the major field, for example, all programs beginning with a "13" fall within the major field of Education. Academic Program or Program or Discipline refer to "an instructional program" (CIP, 1987, p. 8)

programs. CIP was used in this study for several reasons.⁴ First, and most important, this study required a program classification scheme that would help in both the classification and the “naming” of programs. CIP meets both of these criteria. Second, I chose the CIP classification system because it identifies programs using terms widely-shared by students, faculty, and administrators in higher education.

Key Terms in the Study

To explore the question of whether there is currently a unitary or dual system between the TWIs and the TBI in South Carolina, definitions of the following five terms are needed: unitary curriculum structure, dual curriculum structure, program duplication, unnecessary program duplication, and meaningful program uniqueness. A unitary curriculum structure (unitary system) is a structure in which two criteria are met. First, there is not a significant amount of unnecessary program duplication in the TWIs and TBIs being compared such that the TBIs have an institutional identity based on their non-core program offerings. (Non-core programs are those programs that are not essential to providing general and specialized education in the basic liberal arts and sciences at the undergraduate level.) Second, there is meaningful program uniqueness in the institutions being compared such that the TBIs have a significant number of high-demand, non-core programs that are not duplicated by the TWIs. (High-demand programs are defined as those which a disproportionately large number of students can be expected to choose as their major field of study.)

In a dual curriculum structure (dual system), two criteria are met. First, there is a substantial amount of unnecessary program duplication between the institutions being compared such that the TBIs do not have an institutional identity based on their program offerings. Second, there is not meaningful

⁴ In selecting the CIP program inventory as the foundation for identifying programs, I was aware from the outset that this inventory is not without limitation. Most noteworthy, since the assignment of identifying institutional programs by CIP number and code is usually assigned to no more than a few individuals in an institution, I have found that it is occasionally the case that programs are placed in the wrong CIP category; placed in more than one category; or, on occasion, not reported.

program uniqueness in the TBIs, that is, there are not a substantial number of high-demand, non-core programs that are unique to the TBIs. Without high-demand, non-core programs that are unique to TBIs, the vestiges of segregation remain manifest in a dual structure which does not provide a programmatic inducement for other-race students to attend TBIs that they might otherwise choose to attend.

Two terms that are cornerstones to these definitions of dual and unitary curriculum structures also need definition: program duplication and unnecessary program duplication. For the purposes of this study, programs are considered duplicated if they are “broadly similar” to one another. For example, if two or more institutions being compared offer a bachelor's degree in English that program is considered duplicated. Programs that are duplicated are considered unnecessarily duplicated if they are not essential for the provision of general and specialized education in the core liberal arts and sciences at the undergraduate level—that is, only non-core (non-essential) programs may be unnecessarily duplicated. At the graduate level, all programs are considered non-core on the grounds that core programs are baccalaureate-level programs. In United States v. Fordice (1992) the United States Supreme Court affirmed the definition of unnecessary program duplication I established in my study of unnecessary program duplication in higher education in Mississippi, namely, as referring “to those instances where two or more institutions offer the same nonessential or noncore program. Under this definition, all duplication at the bachelor’s level of nonbasic liberal arts and sciences course work and all duplication at the master’s level and above are considered to be unnecessary.”⁵

⁵United States v. Fordice, 505 U.S. 717, 112 S. Ct. 2727 (1992). In my report to the U.S. Department of Justice in this case, which was reviewed by all of the prior courts involved in this litigation, I defined a program as “necessary if the presence of that program is essential for the provision of general education and specialized education in the basic liberal arts and sciences disciplines. In this analysis, baccalaureate degree programs that do not meet this definition are classified as nonessential. . . . At the graduate level, all programs are classified here as nonessential.” My report was titled Mississippi Curriculum Study: A Report for the United States Department of Justice (1987, 96 pp.). In Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana, I used the term “broadly similar” to refer to programs that were duplicated—a term that the U.S. Supreme Court chose to use in the Fordice case.

To explore the question of whether there is currently a unitary (desegregated) or dual (separate) system in South Carolina between the TWIs and South Carolina State University, it is essential to examine whether there is meaningful program uniqueness at South Carolina State University. As defined here, meaningful program uniqueness refers to the presence of a meaningful number of programs at South Carolina State University that are not only unique and non-core but also *high-demand*. Put simply, it is these programs that provide TBIs with a programmatic identity—an institutional identity that goes beyond a racial identity and provides a foundation for attracting a significant number of other-race students.

Purpose of the Study

At the present time, is there a unitary (desegregated) or a dual (segregated) system between the public traditionally white institutions (TWIs) in South Carolina and traditionally black South Carolina State University? This question is addressed on the basis of two criteria: 1) unnecessary program duplication, and 2) meaningful program uniqueness. Both criteria are weighted equally. With regard to the second criterion, Appendix A elaborates on the importance of placing the criterion of meaningful program uniqueness—along with unnecessary program duplication—at the epicenter of this inquiry.

PART TWO: FINDINGS

To explore whether there is currently a unitary (desegregated) or dual (separate) system of higher education in South Carolina, the findings are organized around the two criteria used to address this question: unnecessary program duplication and meaningful program uniqueness. The first section presents the findings concerning unnecessary program duplication and the second presents the findings regarding meaningful program uniqueness.

Unnecessary Program Duplication

Research Question: When South Carolina State University and the TWIs in South Carolina are compared, is there a substantial amount of unnecessary duplication of the programs offered at South Carolina State University?

As a foundation for examining unnecessary program duplication, a list of programs identified as necessary or core is needed (a program is defined as a “core program” if the presence of that program is essential for the provision of general and specialized education in the basic liberal arts and sciences at the undergraduate level). Appendix B identifies the programs that are classified in this study as core programs. For the purposes of this analysis, all non-core programs offered at South Carolina State which are duplicated at the TWIs being compared with are classified as unnecessarily duplicated. If one or more TWIs in a comparative set offers a non-core program that is offered at South Carolina State, the program at South Carolina State is considered unnecessarily duplicated on the grounds that in a unitary system the widespread duplication of non-core programs is unnecessary duplication.

Turning to the two sets of comparisons, Table 1 identifies the programs at South Carolina State University that are unnecessarily duplicated in the statewide comparison and Table 2 identifies the programs at South Carolina State that are unnecessarily duplicated by one or more of the two TWIs in the regional comparison. Drawing on Table 1 and Table 2, Table 3 summarizes these findings by displaying: 1) the number of non-core programs at South Carolina State that are unnecessarily duplicated; 2) the total

number of non-core programs at South Carolina State that are offered; and 3) the percentage of non-core programs at South Carolina State that are unnecessarily duplicated.

Insert Tables 1, 2, and 3

TABLE 1

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE PROGRAMS UNNECESSARILY DUPLICATED:

STATEWIDE COMPARISON

<u>CIP</u>	<u>NAME OF PROGRAM</u>	<u>Traditionally White Institutions</u>	<u>South Carolina State University</u>
11.0101	Computer and Information Sciences	Clemson U.S.C.-Columbia The Citadel Coastal Carolina College of Charleston Francis Marion Lander University U.S.C-Upstate Winthrop	Bachelors (SCSU)
13.0401	Educational Leadership and Administration	Clemson U.S.C.-Columbia The Citadel	Specialist (SCSU)
13.0401	Educational Leadership and Administration	Clemson U.S.C.-Columbia	Doctorate (SCSU)
13.1001	Special Education and Teaching	Clemson Coastal Carolina College of Charleston Lander University Winthrop University U.S.C.-Upstate U.S.C.-Aiken	Bachelors (SCSU)
13.1101	Counselor Education/School Counseling and Guidance Services	Clemson The Citadel Winthrop University	Masters (SCSU)
13.1202	Elementary Education and Teaching	Clemson U.S.C.-Columbia Coastal Carolina College of Charleston Francis Marion University Lander University U.S.C-Upstate U.S.C.-Aiken Winthrop University	Bachelors (SCSU)

TABLE 1 (continued)

		<u>Traditionally White Institutions</u>	<u>South Carolina State University</u>
<u>CIP</u>	<u>NAME OF PROGRAM</u>		
13.1202	Elementary Education and Teaching	U.S.C.-Columbia U.S.C.-Upstate College of Charleston	Masters (SCSU)
13.1205	Secondary Education and Teaching	Clemson U.S.C.-Columbia Lander University Winthrop University The Citadel Coastal Carolina	Masters (SCSU)
13.1210	Early Childhood Education and Teaching	Clemson U.S.C.-Columbia, Coastal Carolina, College of Charleston Francis Marion University Lander University U.S.C.-Aiken U.S.C.-Upstate U.S.C.-Beaufort Winthrop University	Bachelors (SCSU)
13.1210	Early Childhood Education and Teaching	U.S.C.-Columbia, College of Charleston U.S.C.-Upstate Winthrop University	Masters (SCSU)
13.1312	Music Teacher Education	Winthrop University	Bachelors (SCSU)
13.1314	Physical Ed Teaching and Coaching	U.S.C.-Columbia The Citadel Coastal Carolina College of Charleston Lander University U.S.C.-Upstate Winthrop University	Bachelors (SCSU)
43.0104	Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement	U.S.C.-Columbia The Citadel Lander University U.S.C.-Upstate	Bachelors (SCSU)

TABLE 1 (continued)

		<u>Traditionally White Institutions</u>	<u>South Carolina State University</u>
<u>CIP</u>	<u>NAME OF PROGRAM</u>		
44.0701	Social Work	U.S.C.-Columbia Winthrop University	Bachelors (SCSU)
50.0501	Drama and Dramatics/ Theatre Arts	U.S.C.-Columbia Coastal Carolina University College of Charleston Francis Marion University Winthrop University	Bachelors (SCSU)
50.0702	Fine/Studio Arts	U.S.C.-Columbia Coastal Carolina College of Charleston U.S.C.-Aiken U.S.C.-Beaufort U.S.C.-Upstate	Bachelors (SCSU)
50.1003	Music Management	Francis Marion University	Bachelors (SCSU)
51.2399	Rehabilitation and Therapeutic Professions	U.S.C.-Columbia	Masters
52.0101	Business/Commerce	Clemson University	Bachelors (SCSU)
52.0201	Business Admin/Management Note: 52.0101 and 52.0102 are "broadly similar" and therefore combined.	U.S.C.-Columbia The Citadel Coastal Carolina College of Charleston Francis Marion University Lander University U.S.C.-Aiken U.S.C.-Beaufort U.S.C.-Upstate Winthrop University	
52.0101	Business/Commerce	Clemson University	Masters (SCSU)
52.0201	Business Admin/Management Note: 52.0101 and 52.0102 are "broadly similar" and therefore combined	U.S.C.-Columbia The Citadel Coastal Carolina College of Charleston Francis Marion University Winthrop University	

TABLE 1 (continued)

	<u>Traditionally White Institutions</u>	<u>South Carolina State University</u>
52.0301 Accounting	U.S.C.-Columbia Clemson University Coastal Carolina College of Charleston Francis Marion University	Bachelor's
52.0601 Business/Managerial Economics	U.S.C.-Columbia Coastal Carolina University Francis Marion University	Bachelors (SCSU)
52.1401 Marketing/Marketing Management	U.S.C.-Columbia Clemson University Coastal Carolina College of Charleston Francis Marion University	Bachelor's

TABLE 2

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE PROGRAMS UNNECESSARILY DUPLICATED:

ORANGEBURG/COLUMBIA/AIKEN REGION

<u>CIP</u>	<u>NAME OF PROGRAM</u>	<u>Traditionally White Institutions</u>	<u>South Carolina State University</u>
11.0101	Computer and Information Sciences	U.S.C.-Columbia	Bachelors (SCSU)
13.0401	Educational Leadership and Administration	U.S.C.-Columbia	Specialist (SCSU)
13.0401	Educational Leadership and Administration	U.S.C.-Columbia	Doctorate (SCSU)
13.1202	Elementary Education and Teaching	U.S.C.-Columbia U.S.C.-Aiken	Bachelors (SCSU)
13.1202	Elementary Education and Teaching	U.S.C.-Columbia	Masters (SCSU)
13.1205	Secondary Education and Teaching	U.S.C.-Columbia	Masters (SCSU)
13.1210	Early Childhood Education and Teaching	U.S.C.-Columbia U.S.C.-Aiken	Bachelors (SCSU)
13.1210	Early Childhood Education and Teaching	U.S.C.-Columbia	Masters (SCSU)
13.1314	Physical Ed Teaching and Coaching	U.S.C.-Columbia	Bachelors (SCSU)
43.0104	Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement	U.S.C.-Columbia	Bachelors (SCSU)
44.0701	Social Work	U.S.C.-Columbia	Bachelors (SCSU)
50.0501	Drama and Dramatics/ Theatre Arts	U.S.C.-Columbia	Bachelors (SCSU)

TABLE 2 (continued)

		<u>Traditionally White Institutions</u>	<u>South Carolina State University</u>
<u>CIP</u>	<u>NAME OF PROGRAM</u>		
50.0702	Fine/Studio Arts	U.S.C.-Columbia U.S.C.-Aiken	Bachelor's (SCSU)
51.2399	Rehabilitation and Therapeutic Professions	U.S.C.-Columbia	Masters (SCSU)
52.0201	Business Admin and Management	U.S.C.-Columbia U.S.C.-Aiken	Bachelor's (SCSU)
52.0301	Accounting	U.S.C.-Columbia	Bachelor's (SCSU)
52.1401	Marketing/Marketing Management	U.S.C.-Columbia	Bachelor's (SCSU)
52.0601	Business/Managerial Economics	U.S.C.-Columbia	Bachelors (SCSU)
52.0201	Business Admin and Management	U.S.C.-Columbia U.S.C.-Aiken	Bachelor's (SCSU)
52.0601	Business/Managerial Economics	U.S.C.-Columbia	Bachelors (SCSU)

TABLE 3

UNNECESSARY PROGRAM DUPLICATION (BY DEGREE LEVEL) OF PROGRAMS AT
SOUTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

STATEWIDE COMPARISON

	<u>B</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>D</u>
Number of Non-Core Programs at SCSU Unnecessarily Duplicated by TWIs	15	6	1	1
<u>Number of Non-Core Programs at SCSU</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Percent Unnecessary Duplication	56%	60%	100%	100%

ORANGEBURG/COLUMBIA/AIKEN REGIONAL COMPARISON

	<u>B</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>D</u>
Number of Non-Core Programs at SCSU Unnecessarily Duplicated by TWIs	14	4	1	1
<u>Number of Non-Core Programs at SCSU</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Percent Unnecessary Duplication	52%	40%	100%	100%

Degree Level:

B: Bachelors

M: Masters

S: Specialist

D: Doctoral

With respect to the statewide comparison, Table 3 shows that of the 27 non-core bachelor's level programs at SCSU, 15 are offered at one or more of the TWIs; at the master's level, 6 of the 10 non-core programs are also offered at one or more of the TWIs; and the single non-core program offered by SCSU at the specialist and doctoral levels are also offered at one or more of the TWIs.

With respect to the regional comparison group, the findings closely mirror those at the state level. Table 3 shows that of the 27 non-core bachelor's level programs at SCSU, 14 of these programs are offered at one or more of the TWIs; at the master's level, 4 of the of the 10 non-core programs are also offered at one or both of the TWIs; and the single non-core program offered by SCSU at the specialist and doctoral levels are also offered at the TWIs.

In summary, the findings in both comparison groups show a considerable amount of unnecessary duplication—across degree levels—between the TWIs and South Carolina State University.

Meaningful (High-Demand and Non-Core) Program Uniqueness

Research Question: When South Carolina State University and the TWIs in South Carolina are compared, is there meaningful program uniqueness in South Carolina State University as reflected in a significant amount of high-demand, non-core programs that are unique (unduplicated) to the institution?

As a point of departure for examining whether there is meaningful program uniqueness at South Carolina State University, an operational definition of high-demand programs is needed. For purposes of this analysis, high-demand programs are non-core programs that currently attract, and are expected to attract for the foreseeable future, significant numbers of students.⁶ (Appendix C identifies all programs identified as high-demand programs.) By CIP code and degree level, Tables 4 and 5 identify the unique

⁶ The majority of high-demand programs in American colleges and universities are in professional fields of study. At both the undergraduate and graduate level, many of these professional programs are nested within the following major fields of study: business and management, education, engineering, and computer and information sciences. At the undergraduate level, roughly three-fourths of all undergraduate students in higher education major in professional programs and the percentage is significantly higher at the master's level (roughly one-half of doctoral degrees are in professional fields).

(unduplicated), non-core programs—including those that have been identified as high-demand programs—in the two comparison groups. In the statewide comparison, Table 4 displays the following information for South Carolina State University: the unique, non-core programs (including those programs which are high-demand) by degree level. With respect to the regional comparison, Table 5 displays the displays the following information for South Carolina State University: the unique, non-core programs (including those programs which are high-demand) by degree level.

Insert Tables 4, 5, 6

TABLE 4

UNIQUE, NON-CORE PROGRAMS (INCLUDING HIGH DEMAND PROGRAMS)
AT SOUTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY:
STATEWIDE COMPARISON

<u>CIP</u>	<u>NAME OF PROGRAM</u>	<u>DEGREE LEVEL</u>
09.0102	Mass Communications/Media Studies	Bachelors**
10.0101	Agribusiness/Agricultural Business Operations	Bachelors
13.1303	Business Education, Teacher	Bachelors
14.2301	Nuclear Engineering	Bachelors
15.0201	Civil Engineering Technology/Technician	Bachelors
15.0303	Electrical/Electronic and Communications Engineering Technology/Technician	Bachelors
15.0612	Industrial Technology/Technician	Bachelors
15.0805	Mechanical Engineering/Mechanical Technology/Technician	Bachelors
19.0101	Family and Consumer Sciences/Human Sciences	Bachelors**
19.0501	Foods, Nutrition, and Wellness Studies	Bachelors
19.0501	Foods, Nutrition, and Wellness Studies	Masters
1907.01	Human Development and Family Studies	Masters
31.0501	Health and Physical Education/Fitness	Bachelors
51.0204	Audiology/Audiologist and Speech- Language Pathology/Pathologist	Bachelors**
51.0204	Audiology/Audiologist and Speech- Language Pathology/Pathologist	Masters**
52.0209	Transportation/Mobility Management	Masters

**High-Demand Program

TABLE 5

UNIQUE, NON-CORE PROGRAMS (INCLUDING HIGH DEMAND PROGRAMS)

AT SOUTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY:

ORANGEBURG/COLUMBIA/AIKEN REGION

<u>CIP</u>	<u>NAME OF PROGRAM</u>	<u>DEGREE LEVEL</u>
09.0102	Mass Communications/Media Studies	Bachelors**
10.0101	Agribusiness/Agricultural Business Operations	Bachelors
13.1001	Special Education and Teaching	Bachelors
13.1101	Counselor Education/School Counseling/Guidance	Masters**
13.1303	Business Education, Teacher	Bachelors
13.1312	Music Teacher Education	Bachelors
14.2301	Nuclear Engineering	Bachelors
15.0201	Civil Engineering Technology/Technician	Bachelors
15.0303	Electrical/Electronic and Communications Engineering Technology/Technician	Bachelors
15.0612	Industrial Technology/Technician	Bachelors
15.0805	Mechanical Engineering/Mechanical Technology/Technician	Bachelors
19.0101	Family and Consumer Sciences/Human Sciences	Bachelors**
19.0501	Foods, Nutrition, and Wellness Studies	Bachelors
19.0501	Foods, Nutrition, and Wellness Studies	Masters
19.0701	Human Development and Family Studies	Masters
31.0501	Health and Physical Education/Fitness	Bachelors

**High-Demand Program

<u>CIP</u>	<u>NAME OF PROGRAM</u>	<u>DEGREE LEVEL</u>
50.1003	Music Management	Bachelors
51.0204	Audiology/Audiologist and Speech- Language Pathology/Pathologist	Bachelors**
51.0204	Audiology/Audiologist and Speech- Language Pathology/Pathologist	Masters**
52.0209	Transportation/Mobility Management	Masters

TABLE 6
UNIQUE, NON-CORE PROGRAMS (INCLUDING HIGH-DEMAND PROGRAMS) AT
SOUTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY BY DEGREE LEVEL

STATEWIDE COMPARISON

	<u>B</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>D</u>
No. of Unique Non-Core Programs	12	4	0	0
No. of Unique, High-Demand, Non-Core Programs	3	1	0	0

ORANGEBURG/COLUMBIA/AIKEN REGIONAL COMPARISON

	<u>B</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>D</u>
No. of Unique Non-Core Programs	15	5	0	0
No. of Unique, High-Demand, Non-Core Programs	3	2	0	0

Degree Level:

B: Bachelors

M: Masters

S: Specialist

D: Doctoral

Building on the information provided in Table 4 and Table 5, Table 6 shows that at South Carolina State University there are relatively few unique, non-core programs and, most notably, very few unique, non-core programs that are also high-demand. In the statewide comparison, South Carolina State offers a total of 16 unique, non-core programs: 12 at the bachelor's level and 4 at the master's level. And of those 16 programs, *only four are unique, high-demand, non-core programs*—three at the bachelor's level and one at the master's level. These findings are mirrored in the Orangeburg/Columbia/Aiken regional comparison where South Carolina State offers a total of 20 unique, non-core programs: 15 at the bachelor's level and 5 at the master's level. And of these 16 programs, *only five are unique, high-demand, non-core programs*—three at the bachelor's level and two at the master's level. By way of further comparison, not one of the unique, high-demand, non-core programs at SCSU is close to being as high-demand as many programs at University of South Carolina-Columbia and Clemson University.⁷ Indeed, all of the *very high-demand, non-core programs (across degree levels)* in South Carolina's public universities are located in one or more of the TWIs.

How does the data summarized in Table 6 inform this inquiry into whether there is meaningful program uniqueness at South Carolina State University as reflected in a significant number of high-demand, unique, non-core programs? Because South Carolina State University offers very few unique, high-demand, non-core programs—across degree levels—there is very little program uniqueness at South

⁷To illustrate, with respect to 2013-2014 graduation data regarding South Carolina's public universities, the number of graduates in the three unique, high-demand, non-core bachelor's programs at SCSU in the statewide comparison were 13 students (Mass Communications), 59 students (Family and Consumer Sciences), and 19 students (Audiology/Audiologist and Speech Language Pathology.) By way of comparison, U.S.C.-Columbia offered many very high-demand non-core programs including programs not offered at more than one or two other TWIs in the public universities in South Carolina. To wit, in 2013-2014 U.S.C.-Columbia graduated 168 students at the bachelor's level in Public Relations/Image Management and that same year Clemson University and U.S.C.-Columbia graduated, respectively, 170 students and 92 students at the bachelor's level in the field of Mechanical Engineering. All of the *very high-demand, non-core programs (across degree levels)* in South Carolina's public universities are located in one or more of the TWIs.

Carolina State University that meaningfully differentiates the program offerings at SCSU from the TWIs. Put simply, there is not meaningful (high-demand and non-core) program uniqueness at South Carolina State University—program uniqueness that would provide the institution with a programmatic (institutional) identity that transcends the legacy of a race-based identity and, in so doing, would differentiate South Carolina State from the TWIs in South Carolina.

By way of contrast, two of the TWIs in South Carolina in particular—by offering many programs that are high-demand and non-core and are not offered at South Carolina State University—have clearly developed “institutional identities” based on their program offerings. The University of South Carolina-Columbia is the comprehensive flagship university in South Carolina and offers many high-demand non-core programs not offered at SCSU across degree levels. Clemson University, a land-grant and sea-grant university, similarly offers many high-demand non-core programs not offered at SCSU.⁸

⁸See South Carolina Commission on Higher Education website document entitled “Total Degrees Awarded by CIP Code, Institution, and Degree Level: SC Public & Independent Colleges and Universities, Fiscal Year- 2013-2014, Institution Type Public.”

PART THREE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

Summary of Findings: A Unitary (Desegregated) or a Dual (Segregated) System?

Two criteria—*unnecessary duplication* of program offerings at South Carolina State University and *meaningful program uniqueness* (that is, the presence of a substantial number of high-demand, non-core programs unique to South Carolina State University)—were used to address the question of whether the state of South Carolina has a unitary (desegregated) or dual (segregated) system of higher education.

As to the first criterion, there is a considerable amount of unnecessary program duplication, across degree levels, between the TWIs and South Carolina State University. More specifically, the majority of programs—across degree levels—at South Carolina State University are unnecessarily duplicated in both the statewide and the Orangeburg/Columbia/Aiken comparisons. With regard to the statewide comparison, 15 of the of the 27 non-core programs at bachelor's level at South Carolina State University are offered at one or more of the TWIs; at the master's level, 6 of the of the 10 non-core programs offered at South Carolina State University are also offered at one or more of the TWIs; and the single programs at SCSU offered at the specialist and doctoral levels at also offered at one or more of the TWIs. With respect to the regional comparison group, 14 of the 27 non-core programs at bachelor's level at South Carolina State University are offered at one or more of the TWIs; and at the master's level, 4 of the of the 10 non-core programs offered at South Carolina State University are also offered at one or more of the TWIs.

As to the second criterion, South Carolina State University does not have a substantial number of unique, high-demand, non-core programs across degree levels in either of the two comparison groups. In the statewide comparison, South Carolina State offers a total of 16 unique, non-core programs: 12 at the bachelor's level and 4 at the master's level. Most noteworthy by far, *SCSU offers only a total of only four unique, high-demand, non-core programs—including three at the bachelor's level and one at the master's level*. These findings are mirrored in the Orangeburg/Columbia/Aiken regional comparison, where South

Carolina State offers a total of only 20 unique, non-core programs: 15 at the bachelor's level and 5 at the master's level. And of particular note, *SCSU offers only a total of only five unique, high-demand, non-core programs* in the Orangeburg/Columbia/Aiken regional comparison—including three at the bachelor's level and two at the master's level.

In conclusion, because of the unnecessary program duplication—and especially the absence of a significant number of unique, non-core programs at South Carolina State University that are high-demand programs—the vestiges of the de jure segregated system of higher education remain in place in South Carolina. Nested in this context, it is worth noting that that the 1890 land-grant institution South Carolina State continues to have a very limited institutional mission. [The U.S. Supreme Court held in Forde that limited missions are part and parcel of a segregated system of higher education (112 S.Ct. 2741)]. Put simply, South Carolina State University does not have an institutional identity anchored to its programs. Given their limited program offerings, SCSU's "operative mission" remains primarily focused on the purpose for which they were founded: to provide educational opportunity for South Carolina's Black population.

In contrast, two of the TWIs in South Carolina have institutional identities closely tethered to program offerings (across degree levels) that distinguish them from South Carolina State University as well as other TWIs. Notably, the University of South Carolina-Columbia is the state's comprehensive research university—the "flagship" institution of higher education in South Carolina—and Clemson University has a distinctive programmatic identity with extensive offerings at the undergraduate and graduate level in the fields of agriculture and engineering.

Conclusion

In light of this study's findings, it is concluded that there currently exists a dual (segregated) system between the traditionally white institutions (TWIs) and the traditionally black institution South Carolina State University. Without a unitary (desegregated) system—a system that includes unique, high-

demand, non-core programs that provide South Carolina State University with an institutional identity that goes beyond race—the current segregated system of higher education in South Carolina remains firmly in place, and will likely continue to exist for the foreseeable future.

APPENDIX A

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MEANINGFUL PROGRAM UNIQUENESS

The concept of meaningful program uniqueness is fundamental to this inquiry for two primary reasons. First, meaningful program uniqueness at South Carolina State University is closely tethered to eliminating any remaining vestiges—namely, a dual structure—of a historically separate and unequal system of higher education. Second, meaningful program uniqueness at South Carolina State University is critical to ensuring that the institution has an identity anchored in its program offerings which, in turn, encourages other-race students to attend an institution that they have traditionally been unlikely to attend—and, in so doing, desegregating a former de jure system of higher education. This two-fold rationale for the centrality of meaningful program uniqueness in this inquiry is elaborated on in the remainder of this appendix.

Meaningful Program Uniqueness Contributes to Eliminating Vestiges of Segregation

As emphasized by the U.S. Supreme Court in Fordice: “It can hardly be denied that such [unnecessary] duplication was part and parcel of the prior dual system of higher education—the whole notion of ‘separate but equal’ required duplicative programs in two sets of schools—and the present unnecessary duplication [in Mississippi] is a continuation of that practice.”⁹ In so doing, the Court found that unnecessary duplication remains a major vestige of a de jure era of segregation that undermines meaningful program uniqueness in TBIs.

While offering a significant number of unique (non-duplicated) program offerings provides a foundation for distinguishing one institution from another, it is the presence of those programs that are not only unique but also high-demand that meaningfully distinguishes colleges and universities from one another. To illustrate, faculty, administrators, alumni, the public, and above all students frequently assign identities to institutions based on their program offerings that are at once unique and high-demand. A

⁹United States v. Fordice, 505 U.S. 717, 112 S. Ct. 2727 (1992).

good example is the identities of land-grant institutions—identities which are closely associated with program offerings in engineering and agriculture at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Without meaningful program uniqueness—programmatically distinctiveness that provides the foundation of an institutional identity that goes beyond race—a vestige of a prior de jure segregated system of higher education remains in place.

Meaningful Program Uniqueness Encourages Students to Attend Other-Race Institutions

Without meaningful program uniqueness in TBIs there are relatively few inducements for students to attend institutions that they would not otherwise be likely to attend. Two features of “meaningful” program uniqueness—the presence of high-demand programs and the presence of unique (non-duplicated) programs—provide a major incentive for students to select other-race institutions. The two primary features of “meaningful” program uniqueness identified here—the presence of high-demand programs and the presence of unique (non-duplicated) programs—are important for two reasons:

1. Many prospective students consider the availability of highly desired (high-demand) programs in such professional fields as business, nursing, and engineering) as a major consideration in their choice of college or university.
2. The simple presence of a desired non-core program that is not available in a paired institution often provides a compelling reason for a student to choose one institution over another.

In short, if TBIs offer high-demand programs that other-race students wish to pursue—especially if these institutions are the only institution offering the desired program—other-race students are considerably more likely to enroll in such institutions than would otherwise be the case.

That “high-demand programs” and “unique programs” are a major incentive for students to choose one institution over another finds considerable support in the literature on college choice. As discussed in one of the more comprehensive reviews of the factors that lead students to choose one institution over another (Hossler, Braxton, and Coopersmith, 1989, pp. 270-272), the presence of special

academic programs (major area of study) is ranked by students as the single most important factor that they take into account when choosing a college.¹⁰ Although the “special” in “special academic programs” is not always broken apart in the literature such that this term encompasses the dual meanings of “high-demand” and “unique,” the literature lends strong support to the proposition that “high-demand” and “unique” programs are important to students when choosing a college or university.¹¹

In regard to white student choice of TBIs, there have been until recently no major studies of the factors that influence white students to attend TBIs. In one study—which is anchored in interviews I conducted with 80 individuals (32 administrators, 12 faculty members, and 36 students) associated with five Traditionally Black Institutions—we found that of the 14 major factors that influence the matriculation of white students at TBIs, the two most important are: high-demand programs and unique programs (that is, programs not available in TWIs with overlapping service areas).¹²

This study concluded that the most important factor in attracting whites to HBIs is high-demand programs—especially in such fields as business, education, engineering, and nursing.¹³ To illustrate, an administrator at historically black North Carolina A&T University emphasized that white students have,

¹⁰The next six most frequently mentioned characteristics, in order of relative importance, are: tuition costs, financial aid availability, general academic reputation/general quality, location (distance from home), size, and social atmosphere.

¹¹Many studies have asked students to rank the most important factors they considered in applying and enrolling in colleges and universities (see, for example, Bowers and Pugh, 1973; Chapman and Jackson, 1987; Dahl, 1982; Douglas et al., 1983; Keller and McKewon, 1984; Konnert and Giese, 1987; Lay and Maguire, 1980; Litten et al., 1983; Stewart et al. 1987).

¹²In order of importance, the remaining 12 factors were: alternative program delivery systems, graduate (master’s) programs in high-demand fields, positive reputation for quality, student scholarships, low cost, positive image as a multiracial institution, supportive and inclusive campus culture, white student recruitment, articulation and cooperative agreements with TWIs, positive external relations with community and professional constituencies, safe environment, and attractive campus appearance (see Conrad, et al., 1997, p. 43).

¹³In the study, we use the phrase “program offerings in high-demand fields.” The meaning is identical to “high-demand programs.”

in recent years, become very particular in terms of the programs they want to pursue. A white undergraduate student at A&T said that what attracted him to the institution was its programs in engineering, which made him “overlook that A&T is a Black school.” In the same vein, many interviewees at historically black Winston-Salem State University said that it was programs in high-demand professional fields that drew white students to the campus. Several interviewees referred to the bachelor’s programs in physical therapy and nursing: more than 70% of the students in both programs were white. An administrator at Winston-Salem, after emphasizing how career-driven most white students are, said that administrators and faculty at TBIs need to address this fundamental question if they are to attract substantial numbers of white students: “Do [we] have the academic programs that [White] students want for their major?” (Conrad et al., 1997, pp. 43-44)

The second factor identified in this study, unique program offerings, was also found to be an important factor in inducing whites to attend TBIs—especially when programs are in high demand. In a nutshell, many white students I interviewed said that the only reason they chose to attend an TBI was because the program they wanted to pursue was within commuting distance. At North Carolina A&T, for example, many white students said they matriculated to programs in architecture or nursing because these desired programs are either not offered at the nearby University of North Carolina at Greensboro or they have enrollment caps. At Winston-Salem, one administrator said simply that “program duplication” between his institution and other TWIs militates against white students attending TBIs. As he put it: “If both institutions have a program, there will be automatic separation by race.” Echoing the point, a white student said that he came to Winston-Salem because it was “the only game in town.” A faculty member from Winston-Salem used the same language to emphasize that program uniqueness was what attracted whites to TBIs (Conrad, et al., 1997, pp. 44-45).

In summary, the literature on college choice gives strong support to the proposition that meaningful program uniqueness—as reflected in the presence of a significant number of non-core

programs in TBIs that are at once high-demand and non-duplicated—is critical to helping ensure that substantial numbers of non-Black students choose to attend TBIs.

APPENDIX B
CORE PROGRAMS

<u>CIP Number</u>	<u>Name of Discipline (Program)</u>
3.0103	Environmental Studies
3.0104	Environmental Science
5.0102	American/United States Studies/Civilization
5.0107	Latin American Studies
5.0207	Women's Studies
09.0101	Communication Studies/Speech Communication
11.0101	Computer and Information Sciences, General
11.0401	Information Science/Studies
16.0102	Linguistics
16.0104	Comparative Literature
16.0501	German Language and Literature
16.0901	French Language and Literature
16.0905	Spanish Language and Literature
16.12	Classics and Classical Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics
23.0101	English Language and Literature
23.1001	Speech and Rhetorical Studies
23.9999	English Language and Literature/Letters
24.0101	Liberal Arts and Sciences/Liberal Studies
24.0103	Humanities/Humanistic Studies
24.0199	Liberal Arts and Sciences, Humanities
26.0101	Biology/Biological Sciences, General
27.0101	Mathematics, General
30.2001	International/Global Studies
30.2201	Ancient Studies/Civilization
30.2301	Intercultural/Multicultural and Diversity Studies
30.9999	Multi-/Interdisciplinary Studies
31.0505	Kinesiology and Exercise Science
38.0101	Philosophy
40.0101	Physical Sciences
40.0501	Chemistry, General
40.0601	Geology/Earth Science, General
40.0801	Physics, General

Source: The author of this report constructed this table based on the following data source:
IPEDS Completion Survey: 2006-07. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education
Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, 2009.

APPENDIX B (continued)

<u>CIP Number</u>	<u>Name of Discipline (Program)</u>
31.0505	Kinesiology and Exercise Science
38.0101	Philosophy
40.0101	Physical Sciences
40.0501	Chemistry, General
40.0601	Geology/Earth Science, General
40.0801	Physics, General
42.0101	Psychology, General
45.0101	Social Sciences, General
45.0201	Anthropology
45.0601	Economics
45.0701	Geography
45.0901	International Relations and Affairs
45.1001	Political Science and Government
45.1002	American Government and Politics (U.S.)
45.1101	Sociology
50.0701	Art/Art Studies
50.0901	Music, General
54.0101	History, General
54.0199	History, Other

APPENDIX C

HIGH-DEMAND (NON-CORE) PROGRAMS

Source: I identified the high-demand non-core programs based on contemporary literature and writings on current and projected high-demand programs in higher education as well as on the following two sources: 1) South Carolina Commission on Higher Education website document entitled “Total Degrees Awarded by CIP Code, Institution, and Degree Level: SC Public & Independent Colleges and Universities, Fiscal Year- 2013-2014, Institution Type Public”; 2) IPEDS Completion Survey: 2006-07 (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

BACHELOR'S LEVEL

<u>CIP</u>	<u>Name of Discipline (Program)</u>
04.0201	Architecture
09.0101	Speech Communication and Rhetoric
09.0102	Mass Communication/Media Studies
09.0702	Digital Communication and Media/Multimedia
09.0902	Public Relations/Image Management
11.0101	Computer and Information Sciences, General
11.0103	Information Technology
13.1001	Special Education and Teaching
13.1202	Elementary Education and Teaching
13.1205	Secondary Education and Teaching
13.1210	Early Childhood Education and Teaching
13.1314	Physical Education Teaching and Coaching
14.0501	Bioengineering and Biomedical Engineering
14.0801	Civil Engineering
14.0901	Computer Engineering
14.1001	Electrical and Electronics Engineering
14.1901	Mechanical Engineering
19.0101	Family and Consumer Sciences/Human Sciences
26.0908	Exercise Physiology
26.1302	Marine Biology and Biological Oceanography
30.2001	International/Global Studies
31.0504	Sports and Fitness Administration/Management
31.0505	Kinesiology and Exercise Science
43.0103	Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement Administration
44.0701	Social Work
50.0699	Film Video and Photographic Arts
50.0702	Fine /Studio Arts, General
50.0901	Music, General
51.0204	Audiology/Audiologist and Speech Language Pathology/Pathologist
51.2299	Public Health, Other
51.3801	Nursing, (R.N.to B.S.N.)
51.9999	Health Professions and Related Clinical Sciences
52.0101	Business/Commerce, General
52.0201	Business Administration and Management
52.0301	Accounting
52.0801	Finance, General
52.1101	International Business/Trade/Commerce
52.1401	Marketing/Marketing Management, General

MASTER'S LEVEL

<u>CIP</u>	<u>Name of Discipline (Program)</u>
09.0401	Journalism
11.0101	Computer and Information Sciences
13.0101	Education, General
13.0301	Curriculum and Instruction
13.0401	Educational Leadership and Administration
13.1001	Special Education and Teaching, General
13.1101	Counselor Education/School Counseling/Guidance
13.1202	Elementary Education and Teaching
13.1205	Secondary Education and Teaching
14.0901	Computer Engineering
14.1001	Electrical, Electronics and Communications Engineering
14.1901	Mechanical Engineering
25.0101	Library Science and Information Science
44.0401	Public Administration
44.0701	Social Work
51.0203	Speech-Language Pathology/Pathologist
51.0204	Audiology/Audiologist and Speech-Language Pathology/Pathologist
51.0912	Physician Assistant
51.2207	Public Health Education and Promotion
51.2211	Health Services Administration
51.2399	Rehabilitation and Therapeutic Professions
51.3808	Nursing Science
52.0101	Business/Commerce
52.0201	Business Administration and Management
52.0301	Accounting
52.1005	Human Resources Management
52.1101	International Business/Trade/Commerce

REFERENCES

- Astin, A.W., and Solmon, L.C. "Are Reputational Ratings Needed to Measure Quality?" Change, 1981, 13, pp. 14-19.
- Astin, A. Minorities in American Higher Education: Recent Trends, Current Prospects, and Recommendations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.
- Beyer, J.M., and Snipper, R. "Objective Versus Subjective Indicators of Quality." Sociology of Education, 1974, 47, pp. 541-557.
- Black, D.A., and Smith, J.A. "How Robust is the Evidence on the Effects of College Quality? Evidence from Matching." Journal of Econometrics, 2004, 121, pp. 99-124.
- Bowers, T. and R. Pugh. "Factors Underlying College Choice by Students and Parents." Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973, 38, pp. 220-224.
- Carnevale, A.P., and Rose, S.J. "Socioeconomic Status, Race/Ethnicity, and Selective College Admissions." In R.D. Kahlenberg (Ed.), America's Untapped Resource: Low-Income Students in Higher Education. New York: Century Foundation Press, 2004.
- Chapman, R.C. and R. Jackson. College Choice of Academically Able Students: The Influence of Non-Need Financial Aid and Other Factors. (Research Monograph No. 10). New York: College Board, 1987.
- Clark, M. J. , Hartnett, R.T., and Baird, L. L. Assessing Dimensions of Quality in Doctoral Education: A Technical Report of a National Study in Three Fields. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1976.
- Clemente, F., and Sturgis, R. B. "Quality of Department of Doctoral Training and Research Productivity." Sociology of Education, 1974, 47, pp. 287-299.
- Conrad, C. F., and Blackburn, R.T. "Correlates of Departmental Quality in Regional Colleges and Universities." American Educational Research Journal , 1985a, 22, pp. 279-295.
- Conrad, C. F., and Blackburn, R.T. "Research on Program Quality: A Review and Critique of the Literature." In John C. Smart (ed.), Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research , Volume 1, New York: Agathon Press, 1985b, pp. 283-308.
- Conrad, C. F., and Blackburn, R.T. "Current Views of Departmental Quality: An Empirical Examination." Review of Higher Education , 1986, 9, pp. 249-265.
- Conrad, C.F., E.M. Brier, and J.M. Braxton. "Factors Contributing to the Matriculation of White Students in Public HBCUs." Journal for Just and Caring Education 1997, 3, pp. 37-62.
- Conrad, C.F., Haworth, J. G., and Millar, S.M. A Silent Success: Master's Education in the United States. Baltimore, Maryland: John Hopkins University Press, 1993.

- Conrad, C. F., and Pratt, A. M. "Designing for Quality." Journal of Higher Education, 1985, 56 (6), pp. 602-622.
- Dahl, R. W. "College Attendance and Institutional Choice: Results from the Kentucky Longitudinal Study." Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association of Institutional Research. Denver, Colorado: 1982. (ED 220 227)
- Dale, S.B., and Krueger, A. B. "Estimating the Payoff to Attending a More Selective College: An Application of Selection on Observables and Un-Observable." NBER Working Paper, No. W7322. 1999.
- Douglas, P., et al. "Factors in the Choice of Higher Educational Institutions by Academically Gifted Seniors." Journal of College Student Personnel 1983, 24, pp. 540-545.
- Drew, D.C., and Karpf, R. "Ranking Academic Departments: Empirical Findings and a Theoretical Perspective." Research in Higher Education, 1981, 14, pp. 305-320.
- Eide, E. R., Brewer, D.J., and Ehrenberg, R.G. "Does it Pay to Attend an Elite Private College? Evidence on the Effect of Undergraduate College Quality on Graduate School Attendance." Economics of Education Review, 1998, 17(4), pp. 371-376.
- Keller, M.J., and M.P. McKewon. "Factors Contributing to Postsecondary Enrollment Decisions of Maryland National Merit Scholarship Seminalists." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Chicago: 1984.
- Kuh, G.D. Indices of Quality in the Undergraduate Experience. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 4, Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1981.
- Konnert, W. and R. Giese. "College Choice Factors of Male Athletes at Private NCAA Division III Institutions." College and University, 1987, 63, pp. 23-48
- Hossler, D., J.M. Braxton, and G. Coopersmith. "Understanding Student College Choice." In J.C. Smart (ed.), Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research (Vol. 5). New York: Agathon, 1989, pp. 231-288.
- Lay, R. and J. Maguire. "Identifying the Competition in Higher Education." College and University, 1980, 56, pp. 53-65.
- Light, A., and Strayer, W. "Determinants of College Completion: School Quality or Student Ability?" The Journal of Human Resources, 2000, 35(2), 298-332.
- Litten, L. et al. Applying Market Research in College Admissions. New York: College Board, 1983.
- Long, M.C. "College Quality and Early Adult Outcomes." Paper Presented at the American Education Finance Association, Louisville, Kentucky: 2005.
- National Science Board. Graduate Education: Parameters for Public Policy. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation, 1969.

Stewart, N.R., et al., "Counselor Impact on College Choice." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.: 1987.

Webster, D.S., and Conrad, C.F. "Using Faculty Research Performance for Academic Quality Rankings." In J.W. Creswell (ed.), *Measuring Faculty Research Performance*, New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 50, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986, pp. 43-57.